

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3 and 12-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Specification and claim 2 are amended and Fig. 25 is added. The Specification is amended to describe new Fig. 25, which is a plan view of the first embodiment of the present invention. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Ngo in the March 9, 2004 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claim 2 is amended and Fig. 25 is added to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 2-3, 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) U.S. Patent No. 6,195,143 to Ogawa; and rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ogawa. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ogawa fails to disclose or teach a projector including the feature of a condenser lens being further provided at a light-incident side of the liquid crystal device, an incident angle of light that strikes the drive elements reducing in response to a shifting of a center axis of the light incident upon the condenser lens so as to be parallel to an optical axis of the condenser lens, so as to restrict the angle of the light incident upon the liquid crystal device, as recited in claim 2.

Ogawa does not disclose that the angle of light incident upon the liquid crystal device is restricted by shifting a center axis of light incident upon the condenser lens and an optical axis of the condenser lens in parallel so that the incident angle of light that strikes the drive elements become small when the center axis of the light incident upon the condenser lens and the optical axis of the condenser lens coincide, as recited in claim 2. Instead, Ogawa merely shows that the focus of light that strikes the drive elements become smaller.

It is respectfully requested that since claims 3 and 12-16 depend from claim 2, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons stated regarding claim 2. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 12-18 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, it is respectfully requested that Ogawa fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 17 and 18. Specifically, since claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 2, these claims are allowable for the same reasons stated regarding claim 2.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2, 3 and 12-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

JAO:DEB/tbh

Attachments:

New Drawing Fig. 25
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 3, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--